

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action - Status of the claims

Claims 16-27 are pending in the Office Action.

Claims 19-27 are previously withdrawn.

Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Applicants' Response

In this Amendment and Response, Applicants address the Examiner's rejections. Support for the Amendment can be found throughout the Specification. (See e.g., paragraphs [0053] and Figure 1). As such, no new matter has been added. Applicants' silence with regard to the Examiner's rejections of the dependent claims constitutes recognition by the Applicants that the rejections are moot based on Applicants' Remarks relative to the independent claim from which the dependent claims depend. Upon entry of the Amendment, claims 16-27 are pending. Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections of record.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 16 is directed to a method for dissolving an incoming scene of video information which comprises a sequence of fields or frame of compressed video information and an outgoing scene of video information which comprises a sequence of fields or frame of compressed video information. As amended, the method of claim 16 uses a computer-based authoring and editing module to perform the featured steps. Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed method positively recites the apparatus that accomplishes the claimed method steps, and is directed to

statutory subject matter for at least this reason. Claims 17 and 18 depend from claim 16 and are directed to statutory subject matter for at least the same reason.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,606,655 to Arman et al. (“Arman”). (Applicants note that the Arman Patent No. is not listed in the Office Action but was confirmed in a telephonic call with the Examiner and Arman is listed on the “List of References Considered by the Examiner” of June 28, 2008.)

Under Section 102, “[a] claim is anticipated only if **each and every element** as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” MPEP § 2131; *Verdegall Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Applicants’ independent claim 16 is directed to a method for dissolving an incoming scene of video information which comprises a sequence of fields or frame of compressed video information and an outgoing scene of video information which comprises a sequence of fields or frame of compressed video information using a computer-based authoring and editing module. The method of claim 16 also features “applying DCT domain motion inverse compensation to obtain DCT coefficients for all blocks of video information which make up a last frame of said outgoing video scene; applying DCT domain inverse motion compensation to obtain the DCT coefficients for all blocks of video information which make up the first frame of said incoming video scene; and creating a first frame in a dissolve region from said DCT coefficients of said last outgoing frame and said first incoming frame.” The Examiner alleges that Arman discloses these features of claim 16. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Arman is directed to a method for representing video content using representative frames (Rframes). (*See* Arman, Abstract). Arman uses discrete cosine transform (DCT) coefficients to detect scene changes in video. Video content that occurs between scene changes is represented using an Rframe. (*See* Arman, col. 7, lines 31-33 and col. 8 line 64 - col. 9, line 8). Assuming, *arguendo*, that Arman discloses the other features of claim 16, it still fails to disclose or suggest creating a first frame in a dissolve region from said DCT coefficients of said last outgoing frame and said first incoming frame, as featured in the present claims.

In the passage cited by the Examiner as allegedly disclosing this feature, Arman describes:

This system, referred to as content-based browsing, forms an abstraction, as herein disclosed in greater detail, to represent each detected shot, of the sequence by using a representative frame, or an Rframe, as herein disclosed, and it includes management techniques to allow the user to easily navigate the Rframes. This methodology is superior to the current techniques of fast forward and rewind because rather than using every frame to view and judge the contents, only a few abstractions are used. Therefore, the need to retrieve the video from a storage system and to transmit every frame over the network in its entirety no longer exists, saving time, expenses, and bandwidth.

(Arman, col. 6, lines 55-67). It is unclear to Applicants which portion of the cited reference are alleged by the Examiner to disclose or suggest creating a first frame in a dissolve region from said DCT coefficients of said last outgoing frame and said first incoming frame, as featured in the present claims. Assuming that the Examiner alleges that the described Rframe represents the claimed features, Applicants respectfully disagree.

Regarding the Rframe, Arman further describes, “[e]ach Rframe comprises a body, four motion tracking regions, shot length indicators, and a caption indicator.” (Arman, col. 9, lines 29-30). As described in Arman, the body of the Rframe consists of a single frame *chosen* from

the input video, and not created from the DCT coefficients of multiple frames as featured in claim 16. (*See* Arman, col. 9, lines 32-33). The motion tracking regions in Arman track border pixels from one frame to the next and are generated using an edge detection algorithm. (*See* Arman, col. 9, line 62-col. 10, line 2). Mere edge detection as described in Arman fails to disclose or suggest creating a frame in a dissolve region from the DCT coefficients of multiple frames. As such, the described motion tracking regions also fail to disclose or suggest this feature of claim 16. Further, the shot length indicators and caption indicator described in Arman fail to disclose or suggest creating a frame *at all* and therefore, also fail to disclose or suggest the creating frame in a dissolve region as featured in claim 16. (*See* Arman, Figure 1).

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 16 is patentable over Arman. Since independent claim 16 is allowable, its respective dependent claims, 17 and 18, are also allowable.

Based on the foregoing Amendments and Remarks, Applicants traverse Examiner's rejection of claims 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and 35 U.S.C. § 102.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the foregoing Amendment and Remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims of the present application are allowable over the prior art of record. Applicants thus respectfully request the previous rejections be withdrawn, and that the pending claims be allowed. Favorable consideration and timely allowance of this application are respectfully requested. In the event that the application is not deemed in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (212) 408-2538 in an effort to advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul A. Ragusa
PTO Reg. No. 38,587

Robert L. Maier
PTO Reg. No. 54,291

Attorneys for Applicants
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10112
(212) 408-2500